APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/818,185	03/14/97	SCHNIER	R	R0996-140

LM02/0217

STEVEN W. ROTH
IBM CORPORATION
DEPARTMENT 917
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
VU, T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2756	14

DATE MAILED: 02/17/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Nov 22, 1999* _____ .

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____*3*_____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39* _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

  ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

    ☐ received.

    ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

    ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  *Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- *SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES* ---

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1.   This office action is in response to Amendment B filed Oct 29, 1999. Amended claims 1-

15 and original claims 16,18 and 19 are pending. The objections and rejections cited are as state

below .

Claim 17 is canceled

Response to Amendment

2.   Applicant's amendment filed June 24,1998 have been fully considered but they are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.
> This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35

U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any
inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under
37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later
invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35
U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-16,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over

Abraham et al [5,983,270] in view of Andrew [5,835,723]

As per claim 1, Abraham et al taught *a computer system* or communication network [col 1

line 20] *for resolving the first address type and values* (such as IP address) *to a target type and*

value in network such as a method and apparatus to manage the communication of the data and

services between the Internet and its member intranetworks [col 2 line 12-14; col 8 line 15];

a data structure such as SQL [col 7 line 29] *comprising a hierarchical directory*

including a plurality of nodes in a tree structure or network mapping [col 8 line 1-25], *each node*

being a directory scope representing a respective hierarchial level within the network [col 10 line

25] *and address mapping elements defining address mappings* [col 39 line 63];

a plurality of executable methods or processes [col 50 line 15] *including:*

a method for attempting to resolve the first address type and value to the target address

type and value as a function of the address mapping element in a first node at a first

hierarchical level such as attempt to use ID including type policies and value as a logging

function [col 46 line 63] by mapping information [col 49 line 50] as mid-level administrator [col

48 line 47] . However Abraham et al does not explicitly detail the address including address type

and values. The skilled artisan would have looked to the network address art and have found the

address type values ad taught by Andrews et al [Andrews col 18 line 64] which Andrews taught

was utilized in a distributed network using DHCP, a pool of IP addresses and a program code to

resolve the address type and value by matching or mapping multicast addresses [Andrews col 1

line 34,36,66]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the detailed address type and values as taught by

Andrews into the Abraham system in order to enhance the network address mapping method. By

this rationale claim 1 is rejected.

As per claim 2, Abraham-Andrews taught *the first address type and value can not be resolved* (or access deny) [Abraham col 11 line 20,35,48] *to the target address type and value in the first node, a method for attempting to resolve the first intermediate address type and value as a function of the address mapping element in a first node; and*

a method for attempting to resolve the first intermediate address type and value as a function of the address mapping element in a second node at a second hierarchical level, higher than the first hierarchical level [Abraham col 12 line 32-35]. By this rationale claim 2 is rejected.

As per claim 3, Abraham-Andrews taught *when the first intermediate address type can not be resolved to the target type and value in the second node* (or access deny) [Abraham col 11 line 20,35,48] *, a method for attempting to resolve the first intermediate address type and value to a second intermediate address type and value as a function of the address mapping element in the second node*

a method for attempting to resolve the second intermediate address type and value as a function of the address mapping elements in the first node [Abraham col 46 line 63;col 49 line 50; col 48 line 47]. By this rationale claim 3 is rejected.

As per claims 4-6,18,19 contains the similar limitation set forth of method claims 2,3 except a common prefix or network address in IP address [Abraham col 42 line 34]. Therefore, claims 4-6, 18,19 are rejected for the same rationale set forth claims 2,3.

As per claim 7, Abraham-Andrews taught *a method for attempting to resolve the first address type and value to the target address type and value as a function of the address mapping element in a second node at a second hierarchical level higher than the first hierarchical level*

when the first address type and value cannot be resolved to the target address type and value in

the first node [Abraham col 8 lines 23-39]. By this rationale claim 7 is rejected

As per claim 8, Abraham-Andrews taught *a method for attempting to resolve the first*

address type and value to a first intermediate address type and value as a function of the address

mapping element in the first node when the first address type and value cannot be resolved to the

target address type and value as a function of the address mapping element in the first node; and

a method for attempting to resolve the first intermediate address type and value to the

target address type and value; wherein the first intermediate address value and the target

address value have a common prefix[see rejection claims 6,7].By this rationale claim 8 is rejected.

As per claims 9,13,14,16 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1.

Therefore, claims 9,13,14,16 are rejected for the same rationale set forth claim 1.

As per claims 10-12 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claims 2-4.

Therefore, claims 10-12 are rejected for the same rationale set forth claims 2-4.

Conclusion

4.   All claims are rejected.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays during the same hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Frank Asta*, can be reached on *(703) 305-3817 or via e-mail addressed to [Frank.Asta@uspto.gov]*. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-6606 or 308-9731

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [**thong.vu@uspto.gov**].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thong Vu
Feb 9, 2000

LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER